

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy and decomposed animal substance.

On April 8, 1919, the defendants entered pleas of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$50 and costs.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6977. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. Mourmouris & Calomiris, a corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$75.
(F. & D. No. 9493. I. S. No. 14809-r.)

On February 11, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Mourmouris & Calomiris, a corporation, New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on June 22, 1918, from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, of a quantity of an article, labeled in part "Prodotti Italiani Olio D'Oлива Pure Olive Oil," which was adulterated and misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

Average net contents of 3 cans.....	1 pint, 14.40 fluid ounces.
Average shortage (fluid ounces).....	1.56
Average shortage (per cent).....	4.87
Halpen test for cottonseed oil: Strongly positive.	

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, cottonseed oil, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to lower and reduce and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in part for pure olive oil, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Prodotti Italian Olio D'Oлива," "Pure Olive Oil," "Sopraffino," "Italia Brand Lucca Toscana Italia," and "Net Contents $\frac{1}{4}$ Gallon," borne on the cans containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, were false and misleading in that they represented that the article was pure olive oil, that it was a foreign product, to wit, an olive oil produced in Lucca, in the province of Tuscany, in the kingdom of Italy, and that each of said cans contained $\frac{1}{4}$ gallon net of the article, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was pure olive oil, and that it was a foreign product, to wit, an olive oil produced in Lucca, in the province of Tuscany, in the kingdom of Italy, and that each of said cans contained $\frac{1}{4}$ gallon net of the article, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not pure olive oil, but was a mixture composed in part of cottonseed oil, and was not a foreign product, to wit, olive oil produced in Lucca, in the province of Tuscany, in the kingdom of Italy, but it was a domestic product, to wit, a product produced in the United States of America, and each of said cans did not contain $\frac{1}{4}$ gallon net of the article, but contained a less amount; and for the further reason, that it was falsely branded as to the country in which it was manufactured and produced, in that it was a product manufactured and produced in whole or in part in the United States of America, and was branded as manufactured and produced in the kingdom of Italy; and for the further reason that it was a mixture composed in part of cottonseed oil prepared in imitation of olive oil, and was sold under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, olive oil; and for the further reason that by the statements on the label it purported to be a foreign product,

when not so. Misbranding of the article was alleged for the further reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On February 26, 1919, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$75.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6978. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. Mourmouris and Calomiris, a corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50.
(F. & D. No. 9494. I. S. No. 12510-r.)

On April 30, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Mourmouris and Calomiris, a corporation, New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on June 12, 1918, from the State of New York into the State of Massachusetts, of a quantity of an article, labeled in part "Olive Oil," which was adulterated and misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the test for cottonseed oil and the nitric acid test for corn oil to be positive; that the product was a mixture of corn, cottonseed, and olive oils, and that only a small amount of olive oil was present.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that substances, to wit, cottonseed oil and corn oil, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to lower and reduce and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in part for olive oil, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Olive Oil," borne on the cases containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in that it represented that the article was olive oil, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was olive oil, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not, but was a mixture composed in part of cottonseed oil and corn oil; and for the further reason that it was a mixture composed in part of cottonseed and corn oil prepared in imitation of olive oil, and was sold under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, olive oil. Misbranding of the article was alleged for the further reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On May 21, 1919, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6979. Misbranding of cracked cottonseed feed. U. S. * * * v. Athens Cotton Oil Co., a corporation. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$100. (F. & D. No. 9495. I. S. Nos. 16383-p, 16384-p.)

On January 27, 1919, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Texas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Athens Cotton Oil Co., a corporation, Athens, Tex., alleging shipment by said